

## REMARKS

Claims 1-10 were examined in the August 28, 2008 Office Action and stand rejected as obvious over FIG. 1, admitted prior art, in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,499,388 to *Adam*. Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as not described in the specification to reasonably convey at the time the application was filed, that the inventors had possession of the claimed invention. Claims 1 and 6 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as lacking proper antecedent basis. Reconsideration of these rejections is requested in view of the above claim amendments and following remarks.

A. 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph Rejection of Claims 1 and 6 is Addressed.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to change “logic inverter” back to “inverter”. Claims 1 and 6 are therefore deemed to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph Rejection of Claims 1 and 6 is Addressed.

Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis by amending the “inverter” limitation referred to by the Examiner. Claims 1 and 6 are therefore deemed to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

C. Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-10 is Addressed.

The rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over admitted prior art (FIG. 1) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,499,388 to *Adam* is respectfully traversed.

Applicant stands by all of the previous arguments made of record. However, in light of the Examiner’s position regarding the combining of elements (specifically the second power terminal and the output of the inverter) used to reject the claims, claims 1 and 6 have been further amended to recite that “the first power terminal, the second power terminal, the input, and the output are separate terminals”. As previously argued *Adam* lacks a separate second power terminal and an output. Rather, *Adam* teaches only a single output terminal “U” that has additionally been designated by the Examiner as being a second power terminal.

Thus, as previously argued, *Adam* in combination with the admitted prior art cannot be said to suggest the claimed “four-terminal inverter” of the present


invention wherein each of the four inverter circuit nodes are separate as now claimed. The obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully traversed as all of the claimed limitations found in claims 1 and 6 are not present in the hypothetical combination of the two references. Claims 1 and 6 are therefore deemed to be allowable over admitted prior art FIG. 1 in combination with *Adam*. Remaining claims 2-5 and 7-10 are deemed to be allowable as being dependent upon an allowable base claim. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

D. Conclusion.

Pending claims 1-10 all being in form for allowance, such action is respectfully requested. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is kindly asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

November 26, 2008



---

Carol W. Burton, Reg. No. 35,465  
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.  
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500  
Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: (303) 454-2454  
Facsimile: (303) 899-7333